11-118-05

NOV 1 7 2005

PTO/SB/21 (04-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Application Number	09/890,164		
		Filing Date	July 25,	July 25, 2001	
		First Named Inventor	Stepher	Stephen C. Dassoulas et al.	
		Art Unit	3723	3723	
		Examiner Name	Eileen F	Eileen P. Morgan	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Num	per 0275Y-0	0275Y-000312/USB	
ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)					
Fee Transmittal Form		Drawing(s)		After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)	
Fee Attached	Licensi	Licensing-related Papers		Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
Amendment / Reply	Petition	Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		Proprietary Information	
Affidavits/declaration(s)		of Attorney, Revocation e of Correspondence Addr	ess Statu	Status Letter	
Extension of Time Request	☐ Termin	Terminal Disclaimer		Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			
Information Disclosure Statement					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Rema	Remarks The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-0750. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.			
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		,,,,,,,,,,,,		s sopy of the chost to choloses.	
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53					
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT					
Firm or Individual name Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.		Attorney Name W.R. Duke Taylor		Reg. No. 11,306	
Signature					
Date November 17, 2005					
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING					
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.					
Typed or printed name W.R. Duke Taylor		0	Express Mail Label No.	EV 717 344 565 US (11/17/2005)	
Signature W.P.C		X	Date	November 17, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

PATENT

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

09/890,164

Filing Date:

July 25, 2001

Applicant:

Stephen C. Dassoulas et al.

Group Art Unit:

3723

Examiner:

Eileen P. Morgan

Title:

SAW BLADE FOR CUTTING FIBER CEMENT

Attorney Docket:

0275Y-000312/USB

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Election/Restriction Requirement mailed October 18, 2005, please consider the following:

The Examiner requires a restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 and §372. The Examiner alleges that the application includes two groups of claims (Group 1, Claims 1-20 and Group II, Claims 21-28).

MPEP Section 803.01, in pertinent part, states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

A serious burden on the Examiner may be prima facie shown if the Examiner shows by appropriate explanation a

separate classification, or separate status in the art, or different field of search is required.

Here, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie showing that a restriction is proper. The Examiner has failed to show separate classification, separate status in the art or that a different field of search is required. Accordingly, the Examiner must examine the alleged two groups since a serious burden does not exist.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with Applicants' position, Applicants elect Group 1, Claims 1-20.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, she should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully subpritted,

W.R. Duke Taylor Reg. No. 31,306

Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303 (248) 641-1600

Date: November 17, 2005

WRDT/lkj

Attorney Docket No. 0275Y-000312/USB